arXiv:1702.01364v1 [cond-mat.stat-mech] 5 Feb 2017

Solving Moment Hierarchies for Chemical Reaction Networks

Supriya Krishnamurthy
Department of Physics, Stockholm University, SE- 106 91, Stockholm, Sweden

Eric Smith
Earth-Life Science Institute, Tokyo Institute of Technology, 2-12-1-IE-1 Ookayama, Meguro-ku, Tokyo 152-8550, Japan
Division of Biological Sciences, University of Montana, 32 Campus Dr. HS 104, Missoula, MT 59812, USA
Santa Fe Institute, 1399 Hyde Park Road, Santa Fe, NM 87501, USA and
Ronin Institute, 127 Haddon Place, Montclair, NJ 07043, USA

(Dated: February 7, 2017)

The study of Chemical Reaction Networks (CRN's) is a very active field. Earlier well-known results [1, 2] identify a topological quantity called deficiency, for any CRN, which, when exactly equal to zero, leads to a unique factorized steady-state for these networks. No results exist however for the steady states of non-zero-deficiency networks. In this paper, we show how to write the full moment-hierarchy for any non-zero-deficiency CRN obeying mass-action kinetics, in terms of equations for the factorial moments (FM). Using these, we can recursively predict values for lower moments from higher moments, reversing the procedure usually used to solve moment hierarchies. We show, for non-trivial examples, that in this manner we can predict to high accuracy, any moment of interest, for CRN's with non-zero deficiency and non-factorizable steady states.

Models of Chemical Reaction Networks (CRN's) are ubiquitious in the study of biochemistry, systems biology, ecology and epidemiology. They provide a framework within which even several models studied in physics, such as the zero-range process [3], may be cast. CRN's are defined by a set of *species*, *complexes* and *reactions* which, when taken together, specify the system of interest (see Figs. 1 and 2). The mathematical modeling of CRN's is usually carried out either through the study of deterministic ODE's (or *rate equations*) which specify the mean behaviour of the concentrations of the different species, or by modeling the stochastic variability of species counts as a continous-time Markov chain where a transition occurs every time a reaction takes place. One of the major results pertaining to deterministic models of CRN's is the deficiency zero theorem [1, 4, 5]. This relates a topological quantity called the deficiency (which is a non-negative integer index, denoted usually by δ) to the existence, uniqueness, and stability of positive fixed points of the rate equations. In particular, when $\delta = 0$ for CRN's which are weakly reversible, there is a unique, asymptotically stable equilibrium which is of product form, for any choice of (positive) rate constants. A few theorems exist for deterministically-modeled CRN's with $\delta > 0$ as well [1, 6, 7], which either affirm that a given network is capable of multistationarity or can rule out this possibility (See [8] for a recent survey).

Our main concern in this paper is however, stochastically modelled CRN's. A major result for this class of models is the theorem by Anderson, Craciun and Kurtz (ACK) [2], who show that if the conditions of the deficiency zero theorem hold for a deterministically modeled CRN, then the corresponding stochastic system has a product-form steady state, irrespective of the choice of rate constants. This work was motivated by similar results obtained by Kelly [9] for certain stochastically modeled queueing networks. Besides this, there has been work done [10] on the extinction time for certain reactions in stochastic models of CRNs of deficiency one. In general, however, there is no formalism that addresses CRN's with $\delta > 0$.

In this paper, this last issue is of direct interest to us. To summarize our contribution, we provide a description of CRN's with arbitrary deficiency, combining a network decomposition made standard by CRN-theory [5, 11] with the well-known stochastic process formalism due to Doi [12]. As a direct consequence of this description, we are able to write in closed form the entire moment hierarchy of the CRN of interest, in terms of *factorial moments* (FM). The form of the equations for the FM facilitates recasting them as recursion relations for *lower-order* moments in terms of higher-order moments, in direct contrast to how moment-hierachies are generally viewed. Using the fact that very high-order moments take on a particularly simple form (which is again evident from the equations for the FM),we demonstrate, in a couple of examples, how the entire moment hierarchy may be solved to arbitrary accuracy. Understanding CRN's in terms of their moment hierarchies has the added benefit of providing a methodology for understanding when results for deterministic models of CRN's carry over to stochastic models of CRN's (such as the hallmark result of ACK [2]).

In what follows, we utilize two simple examples, both involving CRN's with non-zero deficiency, to explain our results. Along the way, we also provide a definition for the very important concept of deficiency.

Our first example is the following minimal model with just one species and $\delta = 1$,



FIG. 1: A compact graphical representation for a CRN: The red filled circle with label A represents the *species* A while each open circle represents a multiset of species, or a *complex*, such as 2A. The number of solid lines connecting each species to each complex, represents the *stoichiometry* of the complex. Each dashed line connecting two complexes represents a *reaction*.

The reaction scheme for this CRN is

$$\mathrm{A} \underset{\epsilon}{\overset{\alpha}{\rightleftharpoons}} 2\mathrm{A} \underset{\beta}{\overset{\epsilon}{\rightleftharpoons}} 3\mathrm{A} \tag{1}$$

Another example is the following CRN with two species and $\delta = 2$:



FIG. 2: A CRN involving two species A and B. The complex with no solid lines attached to it is the null node "0".

The reaction scheme here is

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathrm{B} \underset{\epsilon}{\overset{k_2}{\rightleftharpoons}} \varnothing \underset{k_2}{\overset{\epsilon}{\rightleftharpoons}} \mathrm{A} \\ &2\mathrm{B} + \mathrm{A} \underset{k_1}{\overset{\bar{k}_1}{\rightleftharpoons}} \mathrm{A} + \mathrm{B} \underset{\bar{k}_1}{\overset{k_1}{\rightleftharpoons}} 2\mathrm{A} + \mathrm{B} \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

In the description of CRN's two matrices standardly make their appearance [5, 11]. An *Adjacency matrix*, denoted by $\mathcal{A}$, is the matrix of transition rates among complexes. The matrix element $\mathcal{A}_{ij}$ for $i \neq j$ denotes the transition (if any) that takes complex j to complex i, with $\mathcal{A}_{ii} \equiv -\sum_i \mathcal{A}_{ij}$. Hence, $\mathcal{A}$ has, by definition, a zero left eigenvector $[1, 1, ..1]$.

For the network in Fig. 1 the adjacency matrix is

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -\alpha & \epsilon & 0 \\ \alpha & -2\epsilon & \beta \\ 0 & \epsilon & -\beta \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

For the network in Fig. 2, $\mathcal{A}$ is a 6×6 matrix since there are 6 complexes: $\varnothing$, A, B, A + B, 2A + B and A + 2B.

$$\mathcal{A} = \begin{bmatrix} -2\epsilon & k_2 & k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \epsilon & -k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \epsilon & 0 & -k_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -2k_1 & \bar{k}_1 & \bar{k}_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & k_1 & -\bar{k}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & k_1 & 0 & -\bar{k}_1 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

We assume mass-action rates (as in earlier work [1, 2]), namely if n_a is the number of particles of species A, the rate at which complex A is converted to any other complex is the rate constant times n_a. Similarly the rate at which complex 2A takes part in any reaction is $\mathrm{n}_a\,(\mathrm{n}_a - 1)$, etc.

One other matrix which is useful to define is the stoichiometric matrix Y. A matrix element $y_{p,i}$ of this matrix is the amount of species p in complex i.

For example, in the reaction scheme of Eq. (1), Y is a row vector and is given by

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 \end{bmatrix} \tag{5}$$

For the reaction scheme of Eq. (2), the Y matrix is

$$Y = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 2 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 2 \end{bmatrix} \tag{6}$$

where the first row refers to species A, the second row to species B and the columns i refer to the complexes in the order mentioned above.

Knowing the above details for any CRN, we can describe the time-evolution of the species involved, via a master equation for the probability ρ_{n}, where n is a column vector with components which are the instantaneous numbers of the different species involved.

For example, for the CRN of Eq. (1), the master equation is

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{\mathrm{n}} = \Big\{ &\left(e^{-\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}} - 1\right)\left[\alpha \mathrm{n} + \epsilon \mathrm{n}\,(\mathrm{n}-1)\right] \\ &+ \left(e^{\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}} - 1\right)\left[\epsilon \mathrm{n}\,(\mathrm{n}-1) + \beta \mathrm{n}\,(\mathrm{n}-1)\,(\mathrm{n}-2)\right] \Big\} \rho_{\mathrm{n}}. \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

where the operators $e^{-\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}}$ (or $e^{\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}}$) act on any function $f(\mathrm{n})$ and convert it to $f(\mathrm{n}-1)$ ($f(\mathrm{n}+1)$ respectively) [13].

For the network of Fig. 2, n becomes a two-component index to ρ, which evolves under

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{\mathrm{n}} = \Big\{ &\left(e^{-\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}_a} - 1\right)\left[\epsilon + k_1 \mathrm{n}_b \mathrm{n}_a\right] \\ &+ \left(e^{\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}_a} - 1\right)\left[k_2 \mathrm{n}_a + \bar{k}_1 \mathrm{n}_b \mathrm{n}_a\,(\mathrm{n}_a - 1)\right] \\ &+ \left(e^{-\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}_b} - 1\right)\left[\epsilon + k_1 \mathrm{n}_a \mathrm{n}_b\right] \\ &+ \left(e^{\partial/\partial \mathrm{n}_b} - 1\right)\left[k_2 \mathrm{n}_b + \bar{k}_1 \mathrm{n}_a \mathrm{n}_b\,(\mathrm{n}_b - 1)\right] \Big\} \rho_{\mathrm{n}} \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The master equation is more conveniently written in terms of an equation for the generating function $\Psi = \sum_{\mathrm{n}} z^{\mathrm{n}} \rho_{\mathrm{n}}$, where z^{n} is to be interpreted as a product when n is a vector. The generating function evolves under a *Liouville equation* of the form

$$\frac{\partial \psi}{\partial \tau} = -\mathcal{L}\psi. \tag{9}$$

$\mathcal{L}$ is called the *Liouville Operator*.

$\mathcal{L}$ has a well-known representation, due to Doi [12], in terms of raising and lowering operators $a^\dagger$ and a.

In the Doi algebraic representation, the Liouville operator for the network of Fig. 1 (and Eq. 1) is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} &= \left(1-a^\dagger\right)\left[\alpha a^\dagger a - \epsilon\left(1-a^\dagger\right)a^\dagger a^2 - \beta {a^\dagger}^2 a^3\right] \\ &= \left(1-a^\dagger\right)\left(a^\dagger a\right)\left[(\alpha-\epsilon a) + \left(a^\dagger a - 1\right)(\epsilon - \beta a)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

The Liouville operator corresponding to the two-species network (Fig. 2) is

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = &\left(1-a^\dagger\right)\left[(\epsilon - k_2 a) + \left(b^\dagger b\right)\left(a^\dagger a\right)\left(k_1 - \bar{k}_1 a\right)\right] \\ &+ \left(1-b^\dagger\right)\left[(\epsilon - k_2 b) + \left(a^\dagger a\right)\left(b^\dagger b\right)\left(k_1 - \bar{k}_1 b\right)\right].\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Here we introduce two sets of creation and annihilation operators $\left(a^\dagger, a\right)$ and $\left(b^\dagger, b\right)$, for the number components n_a and n_b, respectively.

The Liouvillian may be written more compactly in terms of the previously-introduced matrices $\mathcal{A}$ and Y. To accomplish this, we need to introduce a little more notation. Given $\mathrm{n} \equiv [\mathrm{n}_p]$, a column vector which counts the instantaneous values of the chemical species indexed by p, define a column vector

$$\psi_Y^i(a) \equiv \prod_p a_p^{y_{p,i}} \tag{12}$$

$\psi_Y^\dagger \equiv \left[{\psi^\dagger}_Y^i\right]^T$ is then a row vector of components defined on the indices i,

$${\psi^\dagger}_Y^i\left(a^\dagger\right) \equiv \prod_p {a^\dagger}_p^{y_{p,i}} \tag{13}$$

For example, for the two-species network, these are simply

$$\begin{aligned}\psi^\dagger &= \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & a^\dagger & b^\dagger & a^\dagger b^\dagger & {a^\dagger}^2 b^\dagger & a^\dagger {b^\dagger}^2 \end{array}\right] \\ (\psi)^T &= \left[\begin{array}{cccccc} 1 & a & b & ab & a^2 b & ab^2 \end{array}\right]\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

In this formalism, the Liouville operator takes on the simple form,

$$-\mathcal{L} = \psi_Y^\dagger \mathcal{A} \psi_Y \tag{15}$$

The time dependence of arbitrary moments is easily extracted from the Liouville equation via the Glauber inner product, which is a standard construction [14]. Letting $|\phi)$ be the generating function for any instantaneous distribution ρ, the expectation of the time-dependence of the observable n_p^k is

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\left\langle \mathrm{n}_p^k \right\rangle &= (0|\, e^{\sum_p a_p}\left(a_p^\dagger a_p\right)^k (-\mathcal{L})\,|\phi) \\ &= (0|\, e^{\sum_p a_p}\left(a_p^\dagger a_p\right)^k \psi_Y^\dagger\left(a^\dagger\right) A\, \psi_Y(a)\,|\phi)\end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

In particular, the equation for the first moment takes on the general form

$$\left\langle \dot{\mathrm{n}} \right\rangle = Y\mathcal{A}\ (0|\, e^{\sum_p a_p}\psi_Y(a)\,|\phi) \tag{17}$$

In what follows, we refer to the inner product in Eq. (17) as $E\left[\psi_Y(a)\right]$ to simplify notation.

It is useful at this stage to understand the relations between the dimensions of the matrix $\mathcal{A}$ and the matrix $Y\mathcal{A}$.

If $\mathcal{C}$ is the number of complexes ($= \dim(\mathcal{A})$), then from elementary considerations,

$$\begin{aligned}\dim(\mathcal{A}) &= \dim(\mathrm{im}(\mathcal{A})) + \dim(\ker(\mathcal{A})) \\ &= \dim(\mathrm{im}(Y\mathcal{A})) + \dim(\ker Y \cap \mathrm{im}(\mathcal{A})) + l \\ &\equiv s + \delta + l.\end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

Here $\dim(\ker(\mathcal{A})) \equiv l$ where l is the number of linkage classes (A linkage class is a connected component of the directed graph representing the CRN; $l = 1$ for the CRN described by Eq. (1) and $l = 2$ for the Eq. 2). Eq. (18) also provides a definition for the parameter s and deficiency $\delta = \mathcal{C} - s - l$, as required by Feinberg [1].

For $\delta = 0$ networks, all steady states lie simultaneously in $\ker(\mathcal{A})$ and in $\ker(Y\mathcal{A})$ and are termed *complex-balanced*. In this case a convexity argument due to Feinberg implies that there is a unique fixed point for any (positive) value of the rate constants. If $\delta > 0$, this argument no longer applies. In what follows, we derive some new results for CRN's in this category.

It follows from the above discussion that we can define basis vectors $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^s$ for $\ker(Y\mathcal{A})^\perp$. Let also $\{\tilde{e}_j\}_{j=1}^\delta$ be a basis for $\ker(Y\mathcal{A})\,/\ker(\mathcal{A})$. It follows that jointly $\left\{\{e_i\}_{i=1}^s, \{\tilde{e}_j\}_{j=1}^\delta\right\}$ form a basis for $\ker(\mathcal{A})^\perp$.

Then from Eq. (15),

$$-\mathcal{L} = \psi_Y^\dagger \mathcal{A}\left\{\sum_{i=1}^s e_i e_i^T + \sum_{j=1}^\delta \tilde{e}_j \tilde{e}_j^T\right\}\psi_Y \tag{19}$$

That the second sum does not play a role for $\delta = 0$ networks, has implications for the steady state, as we will see shortly. It is worthwhile noting that it is easy to explicitly work out these basis vectors for specific examples (such as the networks of Fig. 1 and Fig. 2) [15].

We will now prefer, without loss of generality, to look at the *factorial* moments (FM),

$$\mathrm{n}_p^{\underline{k}} \equiv \frac{\mathrm{n}_p!}{(\mathrm{n}_p - k)!} \tag{20}$$

As in Eq. (16), the time dependence of the FM is simply given by

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\left\langle \mathrm{n}_p^{\underline{k}} \right\rangle &= (0|\, e^{\sum_p a_p}\left(a_p\right)^k (-\mathcal{L})\,|\phi) \\ &= (0|\, e^{\sum_p a_p}\left(a_p\right)^k \psi_Y^\dagger\left(a^\dagger\right)\mathcal{A}\,\psi_Y(a)\,|\phi)\end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

We can use the relation

$$\left(a_p^k a_p^{\dagger y}\right) = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) y^{\underline{j}} a^{\dagger y-j} a_p^{k-j} \tag{22}$$

where $y^{\underline{0}} = 1$. For $j \neq 0$, $y^{\underline{j}} = (y)(y-1)\cdots(y-j+1)$ for $j-1 \leq y$ and $y^{\underline{j}} = 0$ otherwise. It is now easily seen that,

$$(0|\, e^a (a_p)^k \psi^{\dagger}{}_Y^i \left(a^\dagger\right) = (0|\sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) (Y_p)^{\underline{j}} e^a (a_p)^{k-j} \tag{23}$$

where $(Y_p)^{\underline{j}}$ is the matrix Y with the elements in the p^{th} row modified to $y^{\underline{j}}_{p,i}$. We have put $\psi\left(a^\dagger = 1\right) = 1$, because $(0|\, e^a a^{\dagger y} = (0|\left(1+a^\dagger\right)^y e^a = (0|\, e^a$.

The equation for the time-dependence of $\mathrm{n}_p^{\underline{k}}$ (Eq. 21) may hence be compactly written as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left\langle \mathrm{n}_p^{\underline{k}} \right\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) (Y_p)^{\underline{j}} \mathcal{A} E\left[a_p^{k-j} \psi_Y(a)\right] \tag{24}$$

In Eq. (24), $\underline{j} = 0$ does not contribute since this multiplies $\mathcal{A}$ by a row vector of 1's, which is a zero left eigenvector. If $\underline{k} = 1$, we get the equation for the first moment

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left\langle \mathrm{n}_p \right\rangle &= Y_p \mathcal{A} E\left[\psi_Y(a)\right] \\ &= Y_p \mathcal{A} \sum_{i=1}^{s} e_i e_i^T E\left[\psi_Y(a)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

In the last line we have used the fact that all other basis vectors are projected to zero by $Y_p \mathcal{A}$.

In general, Eq. (24) can be re-written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau} \left\langle \mathrm{n}_p^{\underline{k}} \right\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^{k} \left(\begin{array}{c} k \\ j \end{array} \right) (Y_p)^{\underline{j}} \mathcal{A} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{s} e_i e_i^T + \sum_{j=1}^{\delta} \tilde{e}_j \tilde{e}_j^T \right\} \\ \times E\left[a_p^{k-j} \psi_Y(a)\right] \end{aligned} \tag{26}$$

The above form makes evident why $\delta = 0$ networks with mass-action rates have factorized (Poisson) steady states. For such a network, the entire hierarchy of moments can be satisfied if

$$e_i^T E\left[\psi_Y(a)\right] = 0 \tag{27}$$

for every $i = 1, \cdots s$ where the average is over a Poisson distribution. Note that for a Poisson distribution, an equation for the first moment is the same as a *rate equation* (since $\langle \mathrm{n}^{\underline{k}} \rangle = \langle \mathrm{n} \rangle^k$). Hence, for $\delta = 0$ networks, the condition that the rate equation has a unique solution also guarantees that the entire moment hierarchy is solved, whereby follows the theorem due to Anderson, Craciun and Kurtz [2].

For CRN's for which $\delta \neq 0$ however, there is no general way to satisfy the full moment-hierarchy of Eq. (26) by demanding that any combination of e and $\tilde{e}$ vanish.



FIG. 3: Numerical evaluation of the recursions of Eq. 28 (line) compared to values from Monte-Carlo simulations (symbols) for $\alpha = 100$, $\beta = 10$ and $\epsilon = 70$. For large k, R_k saturates to $\epsilon/\beta = 7$ as explained in the text.

Note however that the $\sum_j$ in Eq. 26 (or Eq. 24), only extends from $j = 0$ to $j = j_{\max}$ with the latter determined by when row p in the matrix $Y_p^{\underline{j}_{\max}}$ vanishes. For the CRN in Fig. 1, $j_{\max} = 4$, while for the CRN in Fig. 2, $j_{\max} = 3$.

This helps us write Eq. (24) as a recursion relation for the ratios of FM's in the steady state. We demonstrate this for the two examples introduced above. For the CRN of Fig. 1 if we define $\frac{\left\langle \mathrm{n}^{\underline{k}} \right\rangle}{\left\langle \mathrm{n}^{\underline{k-1}} \right\rangle} \equiv R_k$, then Eq. (24) may be rewritten *exactly* as the following recursion relation

$$R_k = \frac{(k-1)\left(\frac{\alpha}{\beta} + \frac{\epsilon}{\beta}(k-2)\right)}{(k-1)\left(2R_{k+1} + (k-2) - \frac{\epsilon}{\beta}\right) + R_{k+2}R_{k+1} - \frac{\alpha}{\beta}} \tag{28}$$

Note that we have written the recursion for R_k for descending k. This is because, while we do not know the value of R_k for small k, we do know it for large k, where $R_k \sim \epsilon/\beta$ (as evident from Eq. 28 as well as Eq. 24). If we begin from this 'asymptotic' value at arbitrarily large k, we have a procedure to obtain the value of R_k all the way down to $k = 2$, for any choice of parameters. The result is shown in Fig. 3.

Similary for the two-species CRN of Fig. 2, we can write a coupled set of recursions for the quantities $T_k \equiv \frac{\left\langle \mathrm{n}_a^{\underline{k}} \mathrm{n}_b^{\underline{k}} \right\rangle}{\left\langle \mathrm{n}_a^{\underline{k-1}} \mathrm{n}_b^{\underline{k-1}} \right\rangle}$ and $S_k \equiv \frac{\left\langle \mathrm{n}_a^{\underline{k}} \mathrm{n}_b^{\underline{k-1}} \right\rangle}{\left\langle \mathrm{n}_a^{\underline{k-1}} \mathrm{n}_b^{\underline{k-1}} \right\rangle}$. Using the symmetries of this CRN (in the exchangeability of the species A and B), we obtain under some approximations [15]

$$T_k = \frac{2\epsilon k - \epsilon + k k_1 (k-1)(2k-3)}{S_{k+1} C + R_{k+1} D + E} \tag{29}$$

$$S_k = T_k \left(S_{k+1} C_1 + R_{k+1} D_1 + E_1\right) \tag{30}$$

where C, D etc are functions of k as well as the other parameters in the problem. Again, for large k, it is easy to see(from Eq. 24) that $T_k \sim \left(\frac{k_1}{k_1}\right)^2$ and $S_k \sim \frac{k_1}{k_1}$. Beginning from this value at some arbitrarily large value of k, we can predict values for T_k all the way down to $k = 2$ as shown in Fig. 4.



FIG. 4: Numerical evaluation of the recursions of Eq. 30 (line) compared to values from Monte-Carlo simulations (symbols) for $k_1 = 14$, $\bar{k}_1 = 1$,$\epsilon = 36$ and $k_2 = 49$. For large k, T_k saturates to $\left(k_1/\bar{k}_1\right)^2 = 196$.

To conclude, the structure of the equations for the FM help us write them as recursions for ratios of FM, which then can be solved numerically, beginning from an asymptotic estimate (which the equations for the FM themselves predict). There is a large body of work on efficient ways to truncate the infinite hierarchy of moment equations in CRNs [16]. While our method involves no truncation, it could get more complicated for a large number of species. In this case, it would be interesting if some of the approximations studied in the above literature could be used to systematise the procedure to obtain the recursions we have studied.

It is also of interest whether this formalism can be used to solve CRN's with non-mass action kinetics where, in the case $\delta = 0$, steady states can again be written in product-form under certain constraints [17].

Finally, though we have only concentrated on the static properties here, the Liouvillian contains all information on the dynamics as well. It would be very interesting to investigate these further, in the spirit of [18].

Acknowledgements: SK would like to thank Artur Wachtel for very useful discussions during the Nordita program 'Stochastic thermodynamics in biology' (2015). DES thanks Nathaniel Virgo for discussions and the Stockholm University Physics Department for hospitality while this work was being carried out.

[1] M. Feinberg, Chem. Enc. Sci. **42**, 2229 (1987).
[2] D. F. Anderson, G. Craciun, and T. G. Kurtz, Bull. Math. Bio. **72**, 1947 (2010).
[3] M. R. Evans and T. Hanney, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **38**, R195 (2005).
[4] F. J. M. Horn and R. Jackson, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal **47**, 81 (1972).
[5] M. Feinberg, *Lectures on chemical reaction networks*, lecture notes (1979), https://crnt.osu.edu/LecturesOnReactionNetworks.
[6] G. Craciun and M. Feinberg, Siam J. Appl. Math **65**, 1526 (2005).
[7] J. Haixia, Ph.D. thesis, Ohio State University (2011).
[8] B. Joshi and A. Shiu, Math. Model Nat. Phenom. **10**, 47 (2015).
[9] F. P. Kelly, *Reversibility and stochastic networks* (Wiley, Chichester, 1979).
[10] D. F. Anderson, G. Enciso, and M. Johnston, J. Roy. Soc. Int. **11**, 20130943 (2014).
[11] J. Gunawardena, *Chemical reaction network theory for in-silico biologists*, lecture notes (2003), vcp.med.harvard.edu/papers/crnt.pdf.
[12] M. Doi, J. Phys. A **9**, 1465 (1976).
[13] E. Smith, Rep. Prog. Phys. **74**, 046601 (2011), http://arxiv.org/submit/199903.
[14] E. Smith and S. Krishnamurthy, *Symmetry and Collective Fluctuations in Evolutionary Games* (IOP Press, Bristol, 2015).
[15] E. Smith and S. Krishnamurthy, in preparation (2017).
[16] D. Schnoerr, G. Sanguinetti, and G. R., J. Chem. Phys. **143**, 185101 (2015).
[17] D. F. Anderson and S. L. Cotter, Bull. Math. Bio. **78**, 2390 (2016).
[18] M. Polettini, A. Wachtel, and M. Esposito, J. Chem. Phys **143**, 184103 (2015).